



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,566	07/20/2001	Gopal N. Iyer	60027.0021US01/BS00010	3471

39262 7590 07/07/2004
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

PHAN, HUY Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2685

2

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,566

Applicant(s)

IYER, GOPAL N.

Examiner

Huy Q Phan

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said digital control interface communications link " in lines 5-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

For examining purpose, the examiner assumes that "said" has been changed to

- -a- -.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Warty et al. (US-4,827,499).

Regarding claim 1, Warty et al. disclose in figure 1, a system for providing access to a data file stored (col. 5, lines 64-66) at a digital cellular switch (45) (col. 4, lines 4-5), comprising:

a digital cellular switch (46) capable of communicating via a digital control interface (col. 4, line 63 and col. 6, lines 4-5) and operative to store said data file (col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4); and

an operations and maintenance platform processor (15, 25, 35, 65) communicatively coupled to said digital cellular switch via said digital control interface operative to receive a request for said data file and to retrieve said data file from said digital cellular switch via said digital control interface (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4).

Regarding claim 6, Warty et al. disclose in figure 1, a method for retrieving a data file stored (col. 5, lines 64-66) at a digital cellular switch (45) (col. 4, lines 4-5), comprising:

receiving a request at an operations and maintenance platform processor (15, 25, 35, 65) for said data file stored at said digital cellular switch (col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 27);

transmitting a request for said data file from said operations and maintenance platform processor to said digital cellular switch (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4) via a digital control interface communications link (col. 4, line 63 and col. 6, lines 4-5); and

in response to said request, receiving said file at said operations and maintenance platform processor from said digital cellular switch via said digital control interface communications link (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4).

Regarding claim 10, Warty et al. disclose in figure 1, a method for storing a data file (col. 5, lines 64-66) at a digital cellular switch (45) (col. 4, lines 4-5), comprising:

receiving a request at an operations and maintenance platform processor (15, 25, 35, 65) to store said data file at said digital cellular switch (col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 27); and

in response to said request, transmitting said file from said operations and maintenance platform processor to said digital cellular switch via a digital control interface communications link (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warty et al.

Regarding claim 14, Warty et al. disclose in figure 1, an apparatus for retrieving a data file stored (col. 5, lines 64-66) at a digital cellular switch (45) (col. 4, lines 4-5), comprising: a processor (65) (col. 5, lines 66-68); a memory (67); a digital control interface (col. 4, line 63 and col. 6, lines 4-5) coupled to said processor and operative to provide a communications link to said digital cellular switch. Warty et al further disclose steps of receiving a request for said data file and retrieving said data file via said digital

Art Unit: 2685

control interface in response to said request (col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 27). But, Warty et al. fail to particularly disclose a software component stored in said memory and capable of executing on said processor, said software component operative to receive a request for said data file and to retrieve said data file via said digital control interface in response to said request.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to perform any known method, which contains sequent steps by implementing a software component stored in a memory and capable of executing on a processor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Warty et al by specifically having a software component stored in said memory and capable of executing on said processor, said software component operative to receive a request for said data file and to retrieve said data file via said digital control interface in response to said request in order to improve the speed, accuracy, quality, reliability and cost of a telecommunications system.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, Warty et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejections of claims 6 and 10 respectively. Warty et al. do not explicitly show a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform the method of claims 6 and 10 respectively. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to perform any known method, which contains sequent steps by implementing a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions which, when

executed by a computer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Warty et al. by specifically having a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions which, when executed by a computer in order to improve the speed, accuracy, quality, reliability and cost of the telecommunications system.

5. Claims 2-5, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warty et al. in view of Han et al. (US-6,079,017).

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Warty et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejections of claims 1 and 14 respectively. But, Warty et al. do not particularly disclose wherein said digital control interface comprises a high-capacity inter-processor communications channel between said digital cellular switch and said operations and maintenance platform processor. However, Han et al. teach a high-capacity inter-processor communications channel being used to make connections between a main processor to sub-processors. Since, Warty et al and Han et al. are related to a high-capacity inter-processor communications channel; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Warty et al by specifically having wherein said digital control interface comprises a high-capacity inter-processor communications channel between said digital cellular switch (a main processor) and said operations and maintenance platform processor (a sub-processor) as taught by Han et al. for purpose of providing high

speeds and error corrected protocols to the system in order to improve the quality and reliability of a telecommunication service.

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Warty et al. and Han et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejections of claims 2 and 15 respectively. Warty et al. and Han et al. fail to expressly show wherein said digital control interface further comprises a pair of dual series channel cables communicatively connected between said digital cellular switch and said operations and maintenance platform processor.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to use a pair of dual series channel cables communicatively connected between two communication components. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Warty et al. and Han et al. by specifically having wherein said digital control interface further comprises a pair of dual series channel cables communicatively connected between said digital cellular switch and said operations and maintenance platform processor for purpose of transferring data at highest speed in order to enhance the quality of a telecommunications service.

Regarding claim 4, Warty et al. and Han et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejection of claim 3, Warty et al. further disclose wherein said digital cellular switch is electrically coupled to one or more communications trunks (col. 4, lines 62-63) and wherein said data file comprises a trunk database (48).

Regarding claim 5, Warty et al. and Han et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejection of claim 4, Warty et al. disclose the system further comprising a second operations and maintenance platform processor (16, 26, 36, 66) dedicated to performing operations and maintenance functions with respect to said digital cellular switch (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4).

Regarding claim 17, Warty et al. and Han et al. disclose a system as recited in the rejection of claim 16, Warty et al. further disclose operative to receive a request to store said data file at said digital cellular switch and to transmit said data file to said digital cellular switch via said digital control interface in response to said request (col. 5, line 59-col. 8, line 4). But, Warty et al. and Han et al. do not expressly show wherein software component is operative to receive a request to store said data file at said digital cellular switch and to transmit said data file to said digital cellular switch via said digital control interface in response to said request.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to perform any known method, which contains sequent steps by implementing a software component being operated computer-executable instructions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Warty et al. and Han et al. by specifically having wherein software component is operative to receive a request to store said data file at said digital cellular switch and to transmit said data file to said digital cellular switch via said digital control

interface in response to said request in order to improve the speed, accuracy, quality, reliability and cost of the telecommunications system.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 7-9 and 11-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Guerrero et al. (US-6,185,439) disclose a digital switching network system.
- b) Kasper et al. (US-5,177,780) discloses cellular telephone systems.
- c) Borkowski et al. (US-5,519,760) disclose a cellular network using DCS.
- d) Abu-Shukhaidem et al. (US-6,324,272) disclose DCS of a telecommunication network.
- e) Hanson (US-6,023,624) disclose DCS of a telecommunication network.
- f) Lancaster et al. (US-5,845,894) disclose a service system using high-speed inter-processor network.

Art Unit: 2685

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Q Phan whose telephone number is 703-305-9007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Urban F Edward can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phan, Huy Q

AU: 2685

May 10, 2004


EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600